DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 317 117 HE 023 326

TITLE	A Guide to Self-Study for Commission Evaluation 1990-92.
INSTITUTION	North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Chicago, IL. Commission on Institutions of Higher Education.
PUB DATE	90
NOTE	54p.
AVAILABLE FROM	North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, 159 N. Dearborn, Chicago, IL 60601 ($4.00).
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accreditation (Institutions); Accrediting Agencies; *Evaluation Criteria; Higher Education; *Institutional Evaluation; Reports; *Self Evaluation (Groups); Standards
IDENTIFIERS	*Commission on Institutions of Higher Education

ABSTRACT

This guide assists institutions preparing for evaluation by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education as they organize and conduct their self-study processes and report the results. Chapter I outlines the purposes of self-study and the Commission's expectations for self-study. Chapter II offers advice and suggestions for establishing a self-study committee, developing a self-study plan, and organizing and conducting the self-study process. Chapter III provides a discussion of the four criteria in the self-study process and offers suggested areas of evaluation related to each criterion. Chapter IV highlights the elements of the self-study report essential to the Commission's needs and includes a section on the "Self-Study Report for Candidacy." Chapter V clarifies the information needed from institutions preparing for focused evaluations. An appendix includes information on several organizational resources and over 30 published resources on self-study available from both the Commission and other sources. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED317117

NCA

A GUIDE TO SELF-STUDY FOR COMMISSION EVALUATION

1990-92

North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

Commission on Institutions of Higher Education

HE 023 326

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Commission on Inst. of H.E. North Central Assoc of Coll & Schools
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A GUIDE TO SELF-STUDY FOR COMMISSION EVALUATION

1990-92

North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

Commission on Institutions of Higher Education

159 North Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601

(312) 263-0456 (800) 621-7440

FAX: (312) 263-7462

1990-92

The information contained in this document is accurate as of January 1, 1990. If substantive changes in policy or procedure occur before the next edition, institutions affiliated with the Commission and consultant-evaluators will be notified. © Entire contents copyright 1990 by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. Additional copies of this document can be ordered from: North Central Association, 159 N. Dearborn, Chicago IL 60601. $4.00.

Contents

PREFACE v

I. SELF-STUDY IN ACCREDITATION 1
Purposes of Self-Study in Accreditation 1
The Commission's Expectations for Self-Study 1

II. ORGANIZING, PLANNING, AND CONDUCTING THE SELF-STUDY 3
Initiating the Self-Study Process 3
Appointing the Steering Committee 3
Preliminary Planning 4
Developing a Self-Study Plan 5
A Note About Special Emphases 6
Conducting the Self-Study 7

III. THE CRITERIA IN THE SELF-STUDY PROCESS 9
The Criteria as Bases for Evaluation 9
Criterion One 9
Criterion Two 11
Criterion Three 15
Criterion Four 18

IV. REPORTING THE SELF-STUDY 21
The Purposes of the Report 21
The Structure of the Report 21
The Introduction 22
The Body of the Report 23
The Summary 23
General Institutional Requirements 23
Basic Institutional Data Forms 24
The Self-Study Report for Candidacy 24

V. FOCUSED EVALUATIONS 27
Institutional Report for a Focused Evaluation 27

APPENDIX: RESOURCES FOR SELF-STUDY 31
Resources from the Commission 31
Selected Self-Study Reports 31
Other Resources 37
Selected Publications 37
Selected Organizations, Instruments for Evaluation 39

INDEX OF COMMISSION POLICIES 43

THE COMMISSION AND THE COMMISSION STAFF 47

COMMISSION CALENDAR 48

PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE FROM THE COMMISSION 49

Preface

The North Central Association's Commission on Institutions of Higher Education publishes and periodically revises its three essential documents to provide current information about the Commission's policies and practices relating to accreditation and institutional improvement to institutional representatives, evaluators, and all those who are interested in the work of the Commission. These editions include expanded information in a number of areas and reflect significant new emphases in the evaluation of international education programs and the assessment of student achievement.

The Commission has made conducting a program of periodic self-study a primary obligation of each institution seeking or continuing affiliation with it, both to establish a basis for its evaluations and to foster the attitudes and structures of self-evaluation that every institution needs to survive and progress.

The Commission staff have prepared this 1990-92 edition of *A Guide to Self-Study for Commission Evaluation* to assist institutions preparing for evaluation by the Commission as they organize and conduct their self-study processes and report the results. Together with the *Handbook of Accreditation* and the *Manual for the Evaluation Visit*, the *Guide* provides institutions and team members with information on the principles, policies, and procedures currently governing the Commission's accreditation process. The *Handbook* is the core of this set of documents, and both the *Manual* and this *Guide* assume their reader's familiarity with it. The *Guide* is especially addressed to institutions, but it is also intended for use by Consultant-Evaluators. All three documents are revised and republished on a regular basis. Significant changes in policies and procedures occurring between publications are reported in the Commission's *Briefing* newsletter. Questions about current policies and procedures should be directed to the Commission office.

The *Guide* is organized as follows:

- **Chapter I** outlines the purposes of self-study and the Commission's expectations for self-study.

- **Chapter II** offers advice and suggestions for establishing a self-study committee, developing a self-study plan, and organizing and conducting the self-study process. It has been revised to include specific information on "comprehensives with special emphases," an optional approach to the self-study and evaluation processes to available to certain categories of institutions.

- **Chapter III** provides a discussion on the Criteria in the self-study process and offers suggested areas of evaluation related to each Criterion. This chapter should be read with special care as it contains the most substantive changes of this edition. It provides

specific information on the Commission's new requirement for Criterion Three related to assessment of student academic achievement. In addition, the discussions on Criterion Two, Three, and Four have been expanded.

- **Chapter IV** highlights the elements of the Self-Study Report essential to the Commission's needs and includes a section on the Self-Study Report for Candidacy.
- **Chapter V** has been revised to clarify the information needed from institutions preparing for focused evaluations.
- An **Appendix** includes updated information on resources available on self-study from both the Commission and other sources.

The *Handbook*, *Guide* and *Manual* include an index which tells the reader where information on the Commission's various policy statements can be found in each of the three documents.

The Commission staff hope that this *Guide*, together with the *Handbook* and *Manual*, will answer most of the questions about the self-study process and report that institutions and evaluation team members will have. Please let us know if you have additional questions.

I

Self-Study in Accreditation

Purposes of Self-Study in Accreditation

Ideally, institutions are always engaged in self-evaluation. Self-study as used here refers to the process engaged in by institutions scheduled for comprehensive evaluations. The self-study process in accreditation serves two purposes: to provide the information necessary to determine that the institution meets the Commission's General Institutional Requirements and Criteria and to encourage institutional improvement.

Insisting as it has since the thirties that institutional accreditation be based on an institution's capacity to fulfill its mission, the Commission requires from the institution sufficient evidence on which to make an accrediting decision. Almost three decades ago, the Commission determined that institutional self-study best provides the evidence. Recognizing that careful self-evaluation is crucial to any institution's effectiveness, the Commission has continued to require periodic self-study as a major component of the accreditation process.

The Commission requires that an institution formally examine itself, assess its strengths and concerns, and plan how to capitalize on those strengths and eliminate or alleviate those concerns. In doing so, an institution documents its present effectiveness and its strategies to continue to improve that effectiveness.

The Commission's Expectations for Self-Study

While the Commission does not prescribe the details of an individual institution's self-study process, it does require that every self-study process for candidacy or accreditation be guided by several general principles:

- **that it is built on ongoing self-study efforts.** Ideally, the self-study for accreditation should flow naturally out of ongoing processes of institutional self-evaluation.

- **that it begins with a plan.** An effective self-study process must serve both internal and external purposes. Foresight and thoughtful structuring of the self-study process enable institutions to gain maximum benefits from the time and energy expended.

- **that it focuses on the institution.** The Commission does not accredit departments or programs, although evaluating an institution in terms of the Commission's Criteria requires that all of the institution's component parts be examined. Ultimately, the information gathered through evaluation of each part must be used to formulate an evaluation of the institution as a whole.

- **that it is *evaluative* rather than *descriptive*.** It is not enough for a Self-Study Report simply to describe the programs, operation, and environment of an institution. A Self-Study Report that only describes the institution does not provide the information needed for the Commission's evaluation process.

- **that it identifies clearly the institutional strengths that must be maintained and the areas in need of improvement.** Whether the self-study confirms the adequacy of ongoing evaluation and planning or whether it suggests new priorities and strategies, institutional improvement should always be a major goal of the process.

- **that it produces a report showing that the institution satisfies the appropriate Criteria.** A self-study process for candidacy or accreditation can serve a variety of internal and external purposes, but—whatever else it may do—it must lead to a report that includes explicit documentation that the institution meets the Commission's General Institutional Requirements and fulfills the appropriate Criteria.

II

Organizing, Planning, and Conducting the Self-Study

Initiating the Self-Study Process

For most affiliated institutions, preparation for Commission evaluation begins approximately two years before the evaluation visit when the Executive Officer of the institution receives a reminder letter from the Commission. For an institution applying for initial affiliation, preparation begins when the institution is advised by the Executive Director of the Commission that the self-study process can commence. At this point and throughout the self-study process, the Executive Officer's role is crucial. When the Executive Officer makes it clear by both word and action that the self-study is an institutional priority, the value and success of the process are enhanced.

Appointing the Steering Committee

To indicate the importance of the self-study to the institution, the Executive Officer should appoint the self-study coordinator and the steering committee, should formally charge them with their task, and should provide them with the necessary support to carry out their charge, including support staff and clerical assistance.

The self-study coordinator ordinarily chairs the self-study steering committee, serves as a resource person to the self-study work committees, and coordinates the preparation of the Self-Study Report. The choice of the self-study coordinator and the members of the steering committee is an important factor in establishing the direction and tenor of the self-study.

The primary task of the steering committee is to develop a self-study plan and coordinate its implementation. Those chosen for the steering committee should be knowl-

edgeable and energetic, and they should have the respect of the institution's various constituencies. It is important that they be able to understand the importance of the institutional nature of the process. Each Executive Officer will make these appointments according to his or her personal style of administrative decision-making, but Commission experience suggests that a broadly representative steering committee is likely to receive the cooperation necessary to carry out its task.

Preliminary Planning

Before developing its formal self-study plan, the steering committee should:

1. REVIEW INSTITUTIONAL MATERIALS AND PROCESSES:

- **Determine institutional goals for the process.** If various constituencies within the institution hope that the process will accomplish certain ends then these expectations should be made explicit and incorporated into the steering committee's plans. If the institution has specific objectives it hopes to accomplish through the process, then those objectives should figure prominently in the plan.

- **Review existing committee structures.** A self-study process need not be constructed from scratch, nor need it involve a new layer of committees. The steering committee should decide how best to integrate the structures for self-study with the structures already in place.

- **Survey the institution's existing evaluation and planning processes.** Institutions engage in such processes for a variety of reasons, including the expectations and requirements of their governing boards and those of external agencies to which the institutions are related. Some institutions have developed evaluation processes as a part of applications for or as conditions of external funding. Others engage in periodic evaluation for continued recognition by specialized accrediting agencies. Increasingly, institutions have developed internal evaluation processes to inform decision-making. Rather than duplicate work that has already been done, the steering committee should inventory and use the information gained through these other evaluation processes in its self-study for the Commission.

- **Review the documents of the institution's most recent comprehensive evaluation by the Commission and all subsequent Commission and/or staff actions.** This review helps to establish a context for the current evaluation. Moreover, the evaluation team receives all of these documents; it will want to know how the institution has changed as a result of its relationship with the Commission. It is also useful to review the institution's last Self-Study Report; but be aware that, because of significant changes in Commission policies and procedures, the substance and organization of that document may not be an appropriate model for the current process.

2. REVIEW COMMISSION MATERIALS AND PROCESSES:

- **Read the *Handbook, Guide,* and *Manual* to be informed fully of the Commission's procedures and its expectations.** In particular, the Committee should study carefully the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation or Candidacy in the *Handbook of Accreditation* and in this *Guide*. Since these Criteria are the foundation of the Commission's evaluation process, the institution's Self-Study Report must provide evidence of their being met.

- **Review recent correspondence from Commission staff about the nature of the visit.** The reminder letter sent to the institution's Executive Officer provides information on the evaluation. The letter also includes an invitation to the Commission's **Annual Meeting** which the Self-Study Coordinator and other members of the Steering Committee are urged to attend.

- **Examine the institution's current Statement of Affiliation Status.** Because the SAS defines the status of the institution with the Commission, its accuracy **is critical.** Read with care Chapter III of the *Handbook* and pp. 30-35 of the *Manual* for a better understanding of the flexibility of the language in the SAS. Do not hesitate to call Commission staff for clarification, particularly if you find inaccuracies or decide to use the current evaluation as an opportunity for review of a planned institutional change.

Developing a Self-Study Plan

The steering committee's first major task is to plan a self-study process that both fits the needs of the institution and satisfies the requirements of the Commission. The steps the steering committee should take to develop this self-study plan (which is sometimes called the "prospectus" or "design") are relatively straightforward. It should:

- identify the objectives of the self-study process;

- identify existing evaluation and planning processes and determine how best to integrate these into the self-study process for Commission evaluation;

- identify how the institution will report and respond to concerns expressed by previous NCA teams;

- formulate and implement committee structures consistent with the objectives;

- establish timetables;

- develop a preliminary outline of the Self-Study Report;

- propose the evaluation methodologies to be used to gather and analyze data and specify the data that must be gathered and analyzed;

- establish the reporting mechanisms—writing responsibilities—that will lead from data-gathering to the completed Self-Study Report.

It is in designing a strategy for self-study that the institution can be most creative. Many institutions choose a comprehensive approach to the evaluation; others may choose to speak briefly to the Criteria and to emphasize selected special topics with a view toward significant examination of those areas for improvement. For example, the self-study process may be used as an opportunity to reconsider and revise the institution's mission. The institution may wish to study enrollment trends; or to initiate a more complex system of assessing student outcomes; or to assess the impact of a new governance system; or to begin work on a long-range plan; or to evaluate and revise such a plan. These and other objectives can be compatible with the self-study for accreditation, provided that the self-study process yields the information necessary for the institution to demonstrate in its Self-Study Report that it meets the Criteria for Candidacy or Accreditation.

Because the Criteria cut across functional areas of an institution, one significant task in developing the self-study plan is to plot clearly how an evaluation of the functions and operations of the institution will provide evidence that the Criteria for Candidacy or Accreditation are met.

Once a preliminary plan is completed, it should be submitted to the Commission staff for review.

A Note About Special Emphases

Over the past decade, and particularly in response to the growing sophistication of institutional evaluation and planning, the Commission has encouraged some institutions to develop self-study processes that focus on specific topics. The goal was to make the self-study process both relevant and useful to the institution. In 1988 the Commission began to speak and write openly about the option of "comprehensive with special emphases," in part because the 1987 Symposium, "Rethinking Accreditation," suggested that many institutions might benefit from it and in part because the staff wanted a more formal process to accommodate the increasing number of institutional requests to do something other than the traditional self-study.

In contemplating whether to propose a self-study plan built around special emphases, a steering committee and Executive Officer should consider:

1. whether the institution has adequately developed programs of evaluation and institutional research to provide the data to support the institution's claim that it meets the Criteria for Accreditation;

2. whether there is a strong consensus among various institutional constituencies that the areas of emphasis are appropriate and timely;

3. whether the areas of emphasis are among the most critical issues confronting the institution;

4. whether work on the areas of emphasis will engage a significant portion of the institution's constituencies; and

5. whether the institution is committed to responding speedily and positively to the recommendations that result from studying the areas of emphasis.

In short, a comprehensive with special emphases may be a worthwhile option for **accredited** institutions that are readily capable of providing evidence that the Commission's Criteria are met and are willing to commit serious attention to a select group of critical issues in order to contribute to institutional improvement and educational excellence.

A steering committee contemplating a self-study process built around special emphases should contact its Commission staff liaision *early in the planning process.* Ultimately the staff will develop a letter or memorandum that outlines the Commission's acceptance of the special emphases. That document becomes a part of the official file, accompanying team invitations and all Commission materials used throughout the evaluation process.

Conducting the Self-Study

The ways in which the self-study process is conducted will vary according to the scope, nature, and emphasis of the self-study plan. They will also vary according to the size, complexity, and character of the institution. No single pattern is appropriate to all institutions.

Ad hoc committees are a common mechanism for self-study and should be created in accordance with the self-study plan. It may be wise to include on committees, or at least to provide an opportunity for reactions from, persons who are not directly engaged in the area under study (e.g., student services should not be studied by student services personnel alone). It is helpful to involve those whose interests might be affected by the area (e.g., a student on the student services committee).

A key to the effectiveness of the institutional committees is providing for adequate communication among the various committees and between each committee and the steering committee. And, regardless of how the institution is organized for self-study, there should be some means for communicating regularly with the total institutional community. While it is neither necessary nor desirable to have everyone in the institution on a committee, the steering committee needs to establish means of informing all the institution's constituencies of preliminary findings and developments throughout the self-study process. It should also encourage their responses and use those responses in revising and refining the materials.

III

The Criteria in the Self-Study Process

The Criteria as Bases for Evaluation

Evaluation requires that the quality of an object be judged in relation to some measure. In the Commission's evaluation for accreditation the object is the postsecondary institution; the basis upon which the institution is judged is its ability to meet the **Criteria for Accreditation:**

1. the institution has clear and publicly stated purposes, consistent with its mission and appropriate to a postsecondary educational institution;
2. the institution has effectively organized adequate human, financial and physical resources into educational and other programs to accomplish its purposes;
3. the institution is accomplishing its purposes;
4. the institution can continue to accomplish its purposes.

The institution's evidence that it fulfills the Criteria is contained in a Self-Study Report, and that report then serves as a basis for an external evaluation by a team of Consultant-Evaluators representing the Commission. This chapter provides a general discussion of the Criteria and suggests some areas of evaluation related to each. Additional comments on the Criteria are found in Chapter II of *A Handbook of Accreditation.*

Criterion One

"The institution has clear and publicly stated purposes, consistent with its mission and appropriate to a postsecondary educational institution."

An institution's mission and purposes provide the rationale for both its establishment and the objectives of its current operations. They reveal the philosophical stance of the

institution's designers toward education and provide a framework for maintaining the institution's integrity and planning its development. They point to the heritage of the institution and how it fits within the broader higher education community. They explain how it endorses the traditions basic to higher education such as protecting academic and intellectual freedom and encouraging intellectual breadth and depth.

Educational institutions serve many purposes. Some limit their endeavors to a single task or to a small number of related tasks; others address themselves to a great number of diverse tasks. In a system of higher education characterized by diversity, it is crucial that each institution determine those purposes to which it will commit its limited resources.

The single-purpose institution or the institution with a small number of closely-related purposes is able to formulate a statement of its purposes rather precisely. With a large, complex university this is more difficult, and each major unit or division may have a statement of purposes consistent with the mission of the larger institution.

There are many types of institutional purposes. Some are intellectual, some are affective; some are professional and occupational, some are "liberal"; some involve the pursuit of knowledge through research, others involve public service; some relate to values and attitudes, and others relate to vocational preparation.

As it is used here, "purposes" refers to the multiple and specific ends the institution wishes to achieve in order to carry out its more general "mission." Most institutions have broad, general statements of mission that are relatively brief. Statements of purposes—of long- and short-range institutional goals, of programmatic objectives—are more specific and detailed. Statements of mission and purposes provide a guide for planning and operation as well as a framework for decision-making—about admissions and retention policies; about curricular and extracurricular programs; about the hiring, retention, tenure and promotion of faculty; about the institution's organizational structure; and about its financial and physical resource needs.

An institution's purposes will normally consider its role in its region and community, as well as in the nation. Its statement of purposes should be flexible enough to allow it to respond to new challenges and opportunities, but firm enough to allow it to resist pressures for haphazard or unplanned growth or retrenchment. Its statement should also establish the character and priorities by which the institution can cope with the many demands which it must face.

Accountability requires that an institution accomplish what it says it will do. While it is not a requirement that every purpose lend itself to quantitative measurement, it is important to consider the degree to which the institution's purposes lend themselves to qualitative and/or quantitative measurement because the third criterion requires documentation that the institution is accomplishing its purposes.

An institution has a responsibility to keep the public informed of its educational goals and should publish a statement of mission and purposes in a critical public document such as a catalog.

Criterion Two

"The institution has effectively organized adequate human, financial and physical resources into educational and other programs to accomplish its purposes."

This criterion focuses on the adequacy of an institution's resources and the effectiveness of the institution's organizational structures for the accomplishment of its central educational purposes. Areas that should be evaluated under this criterion include: institutional governance and decision-making, human resources, financial resources, physical resources, educational programs and curricula, support services and institutional services. Many institutions consider the communities in which they are located to be critical to their ability to accomplish their purposes. In assessing how they fulfill this criterion, those institutions should include in appropriate places the human, financial, and physical resources of the community that are of value to them. If service to the community is part of the institution's mission, then under this criterion the programs and services provided for the community will be included.

RESOURCES. An institution's available resources significantly influence the quality of the education it provides. Without sufficient human, financial and physical resources an institution cannot possibly achieve its purposes. Evaluation of the adequacy of institutional resources plays an important role in accrediting decisions.

- **Human Resources.** An institution's ability to accomplish its purposes requires that it attract, retain, and develop appropriate students, faculty, and staff.

  — ***Students.*** The institution's purposes should be reflected in its student recruiting and admissions policies as well as in the educational and support services it provides to the students it enrolls. There is no single measure of student readiness appropriate to all institutions, but the criteria each institution uses should be consistent with its purposes, and with its instructional and other resources. Institutions that admit students under the "ability to benefit" umbrella must have clearly stated and acceptable criteria against which they measure those students and their progress. All institutions need to assess whether they are recruiting, admitting, and educating students appropriate to their unique mission and purposes.

  — ***Faculty.*** The particular kinds of competencies an institution will value and reward in its faculty will vary according to its particular character and purposes. All institutions, however, should have faculty whose academic credentials are appropriate to the discipline taught and to the level of instruction. Institutions preparing students to enter occupations will usually be as interested in selecting faculty on the basis of work experience and occupational proficiency as on the basis of advanced degrees. Academically oriented institutions, on the other hand, will emphasize research competence. Many institutions value most highly the gifted classroom teacher. The point is that

the recruiting for and composition of faculty should be consistent with the institution's stated purposes. Criteria for contract renewal, tenure, and promotion also should be in keeping with the institution's purposes.

— ***Administrative and Support Staff.*** Other groups of instructional and support staff—academic administration, institutional research, learning resources, admissions and financial aid, counseling and student affairs, to name only the most obvious—are critically significant resources to all institutions. The numbers of as well as the qualifications and experience of such staff should be consistent with the purposes of the institution as a whole as well as appropriate to the specific service components in it. Institutions should not undervalue the importance of the people who staff offices and ensure the maintenance and upkeep of the physical plant. The strength and competency of the total staff enable students to focus on their education and faculty to devote attention to providing it.

- **Fiscal and Physical Resources.** The ability of the institution to find and effectively allocate financial resources adequate to its purposes deserves careful analysis. The physical environment and equipment support it provides for educational programs help determine the institution's ability to accomplish its purposes.

— ***Financial Resources.*** An institution must have adequate financial support, properly administered, to provide the instructional and other services that are called for in its stated purposes. It is impossible to establish generally applicable levels of acceptable income and expenditures that are valid for all institutions; in fact, it is not even possible to establish such levels for all institutions of the same type. Moreover, there is no single pattern either of "correct" distribution of income from various sources (tuition and fees, legislative appropriations, endowment earnings, annual gifts, grants from government and other sources, research contracts) or of expenditures for various components of the institution. Instead, the financial structure of each institution must be evaluated in terms of the resources it provides for the institution to accomplish its purposes, and the efficiency with which those resources are administered.

The budget of an institution is a key document since it can express the institution's priorities and plans. The institution's balance sheet and operating statement are also central to evaluating its financial management. They complement the budget because, while the budget is an expression of the institution's immediate priorities and plans, its financial reports are a gauge of its past priorities and achievements and a projection and basis for its future.

Institutions of all types—private, proprietary, and public—use development or foundation programs to garner new or untapped sources of income. Institutions should evaluate the offices, staffs, and programs dedicated to financial development efforts.

— ***Plant Resources.*** The physical plant, including all buildings and grounds used by the institution, whether on campus or at other instructional sites, should also be evaluated. The adequacy of space, of maintenance and deferred maintenance programs, of access, of basic utility, are all important in addressing this criterion. Increasingly institutions must be concerned about the efficiency of the plant, not simply in terms of its demand for energy but also in terms of its ability to serve a wide variety of educational and service needs. Security should not be forgotten in the review of the physical facilities.

— ***Support and Equipment Resources.*** All institutions require equipment ranging from simple typewriters to complex computer networks. Almost all institutions must provide libraries and laboratories (both teaching and research) although the size, number, and diversity of these resources vary dramatically among institutions. The currency of the collection in the library can be as significant as the number of volumes on its shelves; likewise, the sophistication of some laboratory equipment or computer services can be critically important to the effectiveness of the educational program. It is imperative to judge the ability of the institution to recognize the need for and provide for appropriate resources to support the institution and its programs.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES AND SYSTEMS. No institution is wealthy enough to afford the inefficient use of its resources. The ability of an institution not only to find but also to effectively organize resources rests heavily on its organizational structures and the people who fill them. Systems of governance and administration are of greatest interest in evaluating this criterion.

- **Governance.** Patterns of institutional governance vary from institution to institution as do mechanisms for decision-making and implementation of those decisions. The obligations and responsibilities of each component of the institutional community should be clear.

  — ***Governing Boards.*** In the United States, the ultimate governing authority of most institutions rests with lay boards representative both of the public interest and the interest of particular constituencies. The board should establish policies for the institution; translating those policies into action is the responsibility of the administration and the faculty. The governing board should be of sufficient size to assure its ability to protect the integrity of the institution; it should also engage the talents of people understanding of and supportive of the institution's educational mission.

  — ***Coordinating Boards.*** The increasing cost and complexity of higher education have often led supporting groups, both public and private, to establish coordinating boards. The extent to which such governing boards take part in the governance of institutions varies. If such a board affects the institution, its impact should be evaluated.

- **Administration.** If the governing board establishes policies, then the institution's administration assures that the conduct of day-to-day operations of

the institution follow those policies. But within the higher education community in the United States, the concept of "shared governance" means that the faculty contributes to the administrative and decision-making processes of an institution.

— ***Institutional Administration.*** While no single administrative and decision-making structure works for all institutions, the efficacy of that structure requires clear delineation of roles and responsibilities, strong avenues of communication, understood and trusted grievance procedures, and a shared sense of commitment to the purposes of the institution.

— ***Educational Administration.*** The oversight of the academic program typically is lodged with the faculty; faculty often deliberate through a structured body (e.g., faculty senate) and serve on a variety of institutional and faculty committees that provide critical assistance in the administration of the institution. Because some administrators are charged with responsibility for assuring the academic integrity of the institution, the fit between faculty roles and administrative responsibility deserves careful evaluation.

EDUCATION PROGRAMS. Central to this criterion are the educational purposes of the institution. The value of the institution's resources is related directly to their ability to undergird the central educational enterprise of the institution.

- **Curricular programs.** An evaluation of the institution's curricular programs should include assessment of such things as appropriateness, rigor, and viability of major degree programs; the breadth of supporting academic programs (minors, core curriculum, general education, developmental courses); and the level of institutional support for the programs. Such a review should include as well an evaluation of the major documents that delineate the educational programs—catalog descriptions, program brochures, course syllabi, advertising and other recruiting tools—to assure that they are accurate and useful. If the institution has a program through which it periodically evaluates its various curricula, it should evaluate the effectiveness of that program.

- **Special programs.** Some institutions conduct widespread continuing education and off-campus programs; others have special programs for the adult student or for minorities or for constituents in need of retraining. Study abroad programs can be an integral part of the institution's education opportunities; so too might cooperative programs and internships. Off-campus and extended programs, whether in town, the region, the United States or abroad, whether in prisons, hospitals, or military bases, must be included with an institution's accreditation and therefore must receive as careful a review as do the campus programs.

- **Related programs.** Almost all institutions have a variety of programs, many noncredit in nature, through which they accomplish stated purposes. Athletic programs frequently have a substantial impact on the institution and its ability to provide programs appropriate to its purposes. Institutions that emphasize the creative and performing arts will have programs equally as influential. A com-

mitment to provide on-site, non-credit training programs might well affect the organizational structure and educational thrust of an institution. All such related programs should be included within the institution's evaluation.

SUPPORT PROGRAMS. Educational institutions provide a variety of services and programs to shape learning outside of the classroom, to assist students in determining how to make significant decisions about careers, to assist students in learning how to live in and work with groups, to enable students to move smoothly through the bureaucracy of the institution itself, to encourage a life-long commitment to learning and to the well-being of the institution.

- **Student Services.** Almost all institutions include in their purposes some claim to enhancing the maturation, the autonomy, and the "life skills" of the students. Whether it be counselors skilled at giving personal or academic advising or residence managers who make group living situations rewarding, institutions have developed a myriad of support services for students to assist in fulfilling those purposes. In evaluating its ability to accomplish its purposes, the institution must weigh the appropriateness of the programs and their utility to the students for whom they are aimed.

- **Administrative Services.** For many students the most vivid memories of college revolve around registration lines or talking with the financial aid officers. Because the administrative services provided by an institution are important to its success, an institutional evaluation should include an assessment of the effectiveness of these services, including the registrar's office, the office of financial aid, the placement office, and the academic advising system.

- **Alumni/Community Services Programs.** Alumni support can play a significant role in the institution's ability to find appropriate students and to finance their educations. Many alumni programs encourage ongoing learning through study tours and other non-credit activities. For some institutions, the service to the local community also figures prominently in the institution's activities: concert, lecture, and film series; renting of facilities; participation in health and wellness fairs; consulting services through programs aimed at local businesses, and so forth. An institution will wish to evaluate the place of these programs within the institution's work and to measure their usefulness in assisting the institution in accomplishing its purposes.

Criterion Three

"The institution is accomplishing its purposes."

Criterion Three, "The institution is accomplishing its purposes," requires an institution to go beyond documenting the adequacy of its resources and the appropriateness of their organization to providing evidence of its effectiveness in achieving all of its purposes. In providing evidence that it fulfills this criterion, an institution is expected

to use a broad range of assessment approaches. The Commission does not prescribe those approaches. That determination should be made by the institution in terms of its own purposes, resources, and commitments. Assessment is not an end in itself, but a means of gathering information that can be used in evaluating the institution's ability to accomplish its purposes. Assessment helps an institution to provide summative evidence of its present effectiveness, but it also provides information that can be used in a formative way for the improvement of the institution.

An institution is expected to include in its self-study efforts an indication of how it gauges its effectiveness and how it applies that evidence; it reports its findings, and explains how it applies the results of its assessment in making improvements. In organizing this portion of the self-study process and Self-Study Report, an institution might wish to address explicitly each of its stated purposes in order to provide evidence that each is successfully accomplished or it may choose to follow other organizational schema. Elements to be considered as an institution examines its effectiveness include but are not limited to student academic achievement, student development, program quality, community service, special constituencies, and the overall institutional climate.

An institution should consider a broad range of institutional outcomes, but it must have and describe a program by which it documents student academic achievement.

To assist the institution in thinking through a broad range of institutional outcomes, the Commission provides the following suggestions.

- **Student Academic Achievement.** All institutions should develop a variety of measures of student academic achievement. They might include documenting the success of students in moving to the next level of education: how many transfer to baccalaureate programs and how well do they do, how many seek admission to graduate or professional schools and what percentage gain admission, and so forth. Some programs might culminate in licensing exams while others might require that students take standardized exams: both provide evidence of student achievement. Some institutions require senior comprehensives, senior theses, or review by external examiners, all of which are appropriate ways to assess student achievement. Prizes, honors, and fellowships gained by students speak to their academic achievements. Students taking curricula leading to careers or job placement often measure achievement by the speed and ease of finding appropriate employment. Alumni studies might ask students to assess the adequacy of the institution's educational programs.

- **Student Development.** Many institutions strive to enhance the lives of students by providing opportunities for student leadership, by supporting effective programs of health and wellness, and by giving well-received counseling and advising services. For institutions concerned about the values of students, a review of disciplinary actions as well as evidence of positive enhancement of

relationships across racial, ethnic, and sexual boundaries might be included. Institutions with strong religious goals should document success in enhancing the spiritual life of students. Often institutions turn to alumni surveys to assess the long-range impact of student development programs.

- **Program Quality.** Many institutions have in place program review processes, some mandated by external agencies and others designed by the institution's faculty out of their own desires to offer better programs. These reviews should be incorporated in the institution's self-study efforts. Program accreditations also speak to the validation given portions of the institution by external groups; so, too, might the various surveys, formal and informal, which speak to the matter of institutional reputation.

- **Faculty Accomplishments.** For many institutions, teaching effectiveness constitutes the primary measure of faculty accomplishment; student and peer evaluations frequently constitute the methods of documentation. Some institutions value highly the record of publication achieved by the faculty; presentations of academic papers, recitals, exhibits, and so forth also constitute significant achievements. Faculty contributions to the life of the institution might be measured: participation on committees, in advising and recruiting programs, in developing special programs, for example, might be important to the institution. Awards, prizes, and other evidences of recognition should be included as well.

- **Research and Development.** Research universities often find evidence of institutional accomplishment in the amount of external funding they generate; many other institutions document effectiveness of this area of institutional life by the grants they receive. For some institutions, institutional effectiveness is measured in part by the number of projects and reports produced by the institution. Of course, when institutions receive special awards for research or development of new and unique programs, they have evidence of their effectiveness.

- **Public and Community Service.** Institutions might look to the numbers of people participating in programs and courses offered to the public as well as to the numbers of people attending cultural events sponsored by the institution. Some institutions will want to weigh the use of their facilities and services by the broader community. Even if faculty, students, and administrators participate in various community events, the institution will want to assess the overall relationship between the institution and the community in which it resides.

- **Special Constituencies.** Some institutions have particular purposes derived from their relationship to sponsoring bodies. Seminaries have obvious commitments to certain religious bodies; so, too, do many private colleges and universities. Many institutions have goals of serving a wide range of constituents, and they will need targeted programs to accomplish those goals. Success of such programs—those aimed at special minority populations, at the physically challenged, at displaced homemakers, for example—constitutes evidence of institutional effectiveness.

- **Institutional Climate.** Student and faculty satisfaction with an institution speaks to its effectiveness. Questionnaires concerning morale might be used; and some evidence can be gathered from statistics on recruitment, attrition, retention, and program completion. Effective shared governance, whether unionized or not, is important. The vitality of the governing board should be weighed as well. Many institutions conclude that alumni support as well as successful financial development efforts say much about the health of the institutional climate.

Criterion Four

"The institution can continue to accomplish its purposes."

This Criterion captures the institution's potential for continuing effectiveness, and the Self-Study Report must provide evidence that such continuing effectiveness is likely. Past and present success as well as able leadership, adequate resources, and sound planning speak to an institution's ability to respond to future challenges while maintaining its effectiveness and improving its quality. In this Criterion the institution also addresses the formative aspect of evaluation, the institution's plans for educational improvement resulting from the self-study effort.

- **Institutional Planning.** Effective planning structures provide the means to modify goals, develop programs, alter methods of instruction, cope with shifting levels and sources of support, and continually monitor institutional vitality. Long- and short-range planning combined with strategic planning provide most institutions with effective tools to meet the future. The Self-Study Report should identify the plans that exist as well as evaluate the institution's past record of planning. It should describe the various planning committees and processes at the institution, and explain how the institution evaluates the usefulness of its planning processes. Some institutions participate in externally-mandated planning, planning required by legislatures or higher education boards, for example. Whatever the planning process, it is important to know who participate in it and how well it is understood by all constituencies in the institution.

- **Institutional Stability.** Most people point to the stability of faculty and administration as well as to a strong, stable governing board as evidence of institutional stability. The strength of the institution's financial base, including the health of the endowment, is evidence as well. Trends of stable or growing enrollments might testify to the stability of institutions. Even institutions that have experienced considerable change might claim that the institution's resiliency and flexibility to challenges in the past suggests that the institution is equipped to confront them in the future.

- **Self-Study Process.** Even for institutions with elaborate, tested planning processes, the self-study preparation for the accreditation visit can assist the institution in identifying new problems, in developing consensus on future institutional

priorities, and in proposing strategies not yet captured in other plans. It is important to evaluate how well the findings of the self-study process integrate with other planning processes. Many self-study processes have goals specific to the institution; the success of the process in accomplishing those goals speaks to the institution's ability to move forward in the future. Ideally, the recommendations of the self-study effort are incorporated into the institution's ongoing planning processes.

- **Educational Improvement.** The centrality of the institution's educational programs needs to be highlighted when the institution looks toward the future. Institutions with regularized review of all academic programs should assess how those reviews contribute to strengthening the programs. Future financial planning should make clear whether the institution intends to allocate funds to strengthen the educational programs. Strong assessment programs ought to feed directly into planning processes, thus assuring that the findings of the assessments lead to needed improvements. If the self-study process itself identifies ways to strengthen the educational program, then it is important to assess the impact of those findings for the future of the institution.

IV

Reporting the Self-Study

The Purposes of the Report

An institution's Self-Study Report plays specific roles in the Commission's processes:

- it constitutes the institution's formal request for initial or continued accreditation;
- it summarizes the purposes and findings of the self-study process;
- it demonstrates the institution's ability to analyze its effectiveness and develop plans for its own improvement;
- it provides evidence that the institution fulfills the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation;
- it succinctly summarizes information necessary for the evaluation visit, the review process, and Commission action.

The report should be a well-written, readable narrative, not a collection of tables, charts, and graphs. It should be concise yet thorough. It should be written with the other materials its readers will have access to in mind. Since the Self-Study Report is a part of a set of materials—which includes Basic Institutional Data Forms, faculty and student handbooks, and the catalog—it need not repeat at length information that its readers will find elsewhere. The documents for comprehensive evaluations are listed in the *Manual*, Appendix C.

The Structure of the Report

There is no single way to organize the Self-Study Report. Each institution is encouraged to present its report in the manner best suited to its own purposes and needs,

flowing from its self-study plan and process. However, while there are various ways to structure the Self-Study Report, its uses in the Commission's evaluation process require that every report contain **three essential elements:**

- an **introduction** that provides the context for the evaluation;
- the **body of the report** that, regardless of how it is organized, includes an evaluation of the institution in terms of the Criteria for Accreditation;
- a **final section** in which the institution makes its request for the affiliation sought, including any changes in its Statement of Affiliation Status.

The Introduction

The first essential element of every Self-Study Report addressed to the Commission is a clear, concise introduction that provides certain information to give the reader a context within which to read what follows. This introduction should describe:

- **The purposes of the report.** The purposes of the report should be specified, so that readers will understand what follows. One purpose will be to gain or continue accreditation, but there may be other purposes as well.
- **The self-study process.** How committees were established and staffed, the methods used to assure appropriate participation in the process, any special features of the self-study should be discussed.
- **The organization of the report.** Because each institution may organize its report differently, an explanation of the basic structure of the report is of great assistance to readers.
- **A summary of the accreditation history of the institution.** This brief section should identify when the institution first became affiliated with the Commission, when it was first accredited, when it last underwent a comprehensive evaluation, and any focused evaluations and/or changes approved by the Commission since the most recent comprehensive evaluation.
- **How the report will present the institution's response to the most recent NCA report.** Since the evaluation team receives copies of the most recent comprehensive Team Report and formal institutional response, as well as copies of subsequent focused reports and formal responses, and information on any other changes approved by the Commission, the institution should comment on where and how the current Self-Study Report will treat concerns identified by previous Commission reviews. The report may treat the institution's subsequent actions to eliminate or alleviate those concerns in a variety of ways (e.g., in the introduction itself, as part of the sections of the report devoted to the areas to which the concerns were relevant, or in a separate chapter), but the way the concerns will be addressed in the report should be described at the outset.

- **Changes and/or significant developments since the most recent comprehensive evaluation.** The Commission's requirement that all institutions affiliated with it be evaluated periodically is designed in part to monitor the changes that institutions undergo. Significant changes that have occurred since the last comprehensive evaluation should be explained in the introduction so that the evaluation team will understand the current character of the institution.

- **Unusual aspects of the institution.** The introduction should orient the reader to the special qualities, programs, structures that the institution thinks distinguish it. The better informed Commission representatives are, the better able they will be to consider the institution in terms of its own mission and purposes.

The Body of the Report

The body of the Self-Study Report may be organized in a variety of ways, **but it must include an explicit evaluation of the institution in terms of the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation.**

Some institutions structure their reports around the Criteria; others choose to organize their reports around functional topics with a concluding chapter in which each criterion is explicitly mentioned together with a description of where and how the body of the report substantiates the claim that the criterion is fulfilled. Some institutions might have structured a self-study process around special emphases; their Self-Study Reports will emphasize those topics but will include a chapter or chapters that provide evidence that the Criteria are met.

The Summary

In the final section of the Self-Study Report, the institution states its request for the status sought, and justifies any changes it wants in its Statement of Affiliation Status. The institution's rationale for each of its requests will be a summary judgment supported by reference to the salient points discussed in the body of the Self-Study Report.

General Institutional Requirements

The Self-Study Report must also demonstrate that the institution meets the General Institutional Requirements. These are quite explicit "threshold" requirements, in contrast to the Criteria, which require more detailed judgments. Addressing the GIRs requires examining specific details about its programs, organization, operation and public disclosure. Commentary on the GIRs is found in Chapter II of the *Handbook*. Documentation that the institution meets the GIRs can be provided as an appendix of the Self-Study Report.

Basic Institutional Data Forms

Each institution is required to complete a set of Basic Institutional Data Forms. These forms, which are sent to the institution by the Commission, ask for certain kinds of quantitative information to assist the team in its qualitative evaluation. The forms may be bound into the Self-Study Report as an appendix or may be submitted with the report as a separate document. Information should not differ significantly from that reported in the Self-Study Report. Where differences occur a note of explanation on the form may be useful.

The Self-Study Report for Candidacy

Like the Self-Study Report for initial or continued accreditation, the Self-Study Report for initial or continued candidacy must contain three essential elements. The type of information required for all three elements is quite similar to the report for accreditation. However, the second element, addressing the Criteria, differs because the Criteria are different.

- **Criterion One:** "The institution has clear and publicly stated purposes, consistent with its mission and appropriate to a postsecondary educational institution."

  This Criterion is the same for accreditation.

- **Criterion Two:** "The institution has effectively organized adequate human, financial and physical resources into educational and other programs so that it is accomplishing its immediate purposes."

  This differs from the second Criterion for Accreditation in that it speaks of accomplishing immediate purposes, which acknowledges that a candidate institution is not yet fully developed to the point at which it has the ability to accomplish all of its purposes. In addition to having organized effectively its current resources, a candidate must give evidence that it is accomplishing its current purposes.

- **Criterion Three:** "The institution is following realistic plans to acquire and organize any additional resources needed to accomplish its stated purposes."

  This directs attention to the candidate's plans for development within the candidacy period. It requires that the candidate demonstrate that it has conducted a self-study that has identified its strengths and areas of concern. Moreover, the institution must identify the planning that shows how and when the additional resources will be in place to enable the institution to accomplish all its stated purposes within the candidacy period.

- **Criterion Four:** "The institution has the potential to achieve accreditation within the candidacy period."

> A candidate institution develops a plan and timetable to achieve accreditation in six years or less. The plan and timetable should be appropriate and realistic. In demonstrating that it meets this Criterion, the institution must consider each of the Criteria for Accreditation and indicate which Criteria it does not currently meet and what it must do to meet all of them.

The Criteria for Accreditation are discussed in detail in Chapter II of *A Handbook of Accreditation* and in Chapter III of this *Guide*.

The discussion of the Criteria changes with each successive report for continued candidacy. Through its successive Self-Study Reports, the candidate institution demonstrates not only that it still meets the Criteria for Candidacy, but also that it continues to move closer to the goal of fulfilling the Criteria for Accreditation.

It is particularly important that an institution seeking or maintaining candidacy with the Commission provide explicit evidence that it meets each of the General Institutional Requirements. Even though this information has already been sent to the Commission, the Requirements must be identified and addressed as an integral part of the Self-Study Report. The team, the review process, and the Commission must be able to judge that the Requirements are met. This will continue to be an integral part of the Self-Study Report throughout the candidacy period and as the institution seeks initial accreditation.

V

Focused Evaluations

Institutional Report for a Focused Evaluation

Focused evaluations are of two types—those mandated by prior Commission action to evaluate specific areas or issues within institutions, and those that occur as part of review of proposed institutional changes. Focused evaluations do not require the comprehensive institutional self-study process outlined in the rest of this *Guide* nor do they require a comprehensive Self-Study Report. An institution's preparation for a focused evaluation will vary in nature and scope according to the specific areas to be examined. Its report will concentrate on those areas. In addition, the materials for the evaluation will include any documents the institution and the Commission staff believe the team should have before arriving on campus, including but not limited to catalogs, faculty and student handbooks, and relevant portions of the Commission's Basic Institutional Data Forms.

Because focused evaluations are so specific and usually are limited to two or three topics or areas, institutional reports for focused evaluations will vary considerably in structure, concept, and length. It is important to assess the specific areas of focus in relation to the overall institutional context—for example, if a focused evaluation is scheduled to review faculty-administration relations, the report should comment on the effect these issues have had on the educational program and student morale. Institutions preparing for a focused evaluation should maintain regular contact with the Commission staff liaison and discuss plans for the report.

The report any given institution prepares will be shaped by the specific issues that prompted the evaluation, but all institutional reports for focused evaluations will have the following structure:

- an introduction;
- an examination of the area(s) of focus.

In the **introduction** the institution briefly cites the Commission action or policy that prompted the evaluation, discusses the process by which the report has been prepared, and explains the organization of the report.

The **body** of a focused report is an evaluation of the areas to be examined. If the focused evaluation is being conducted to assess progress in responding to previous Commission concerns, this section of the report will explain the actions that have been taken since the last evaluation. It should evaluate the progress made and indicate any further actions that may be planned. Depending on the areas of focus, this part of the report may be supplemented by audited financial statements, Board minutes, curriculum information, or other appendices that document the progress summarized in the report itself.

The institutional report for a focused evaluation has no required length. Some will be brief; others will be lengthy. The guideline in preparing the report should be that it cover each of these essential elements adequately.

Focused reports for institutional change follow the same basic format, but include one additional required element:

- a formal request for specific changes in the institution's Statement of Affiliation Status.

To support that request, this section of the report must address these points:

1. **A concise statement of the requested change and the reasons for proposing it.**

   In addressing this question an institution should outline the planning process that led to the request for the change and indicate clearly that thoughtful assessment of needs and resources has taken place.

2. **Evidence that the institution has the necessary internal and external approvals to initiate the change.**

   An institution should state clearly what faculty, administrative, and governing board approvals are needed for the proposed change and document that these approvals are in order. The type of external approval needed will vary from institution to institution and from state to state. Each of the nineteen states in the region has different regulations. When contemplating off-campus sites or branches the institution should contact the appropriate state higher education agency early in the planning process, especially if the branch is in a state in which it has not operated in the past. The institution must provide evidence to the Commission that all legal requirements have been met. If no external approval is required, that should be stated and documentation provided.

3. **Evidence that the purposes of the change are clear and appropriate to the institution's purposes.**

   Any change will in some way affect an institution's purposes. The report should give evidence that the change is congruent with the overall purposes of the

institution and is a logical development at this point in the institution's history. The institution should also be clear as to whether it is part of a planned series of changes.

4. **An analysis of the anticipated effect of the proposed change on the other parts of the institution and on the institution's ability to meet the General Institutional Requirements.**

   Any time an institution makes a change that change will have an effect on the institution's other activities. Institutions should address this issue critically in their reports; it is not sufficient simply to state that the change will have no effect on the institution or to state that any change will be salutary. Although the institution need not address each General Institutional Requirement in its report, it must provide evidence that it has reviewed the GIRs and can assure the institution's compliance with them even after implementing the proposed change.

5. **Evidence that the institution has organized adequate human, financial and physical resources and processes to initiate, maintain, and monitor the change and to assure acceptable quality.**

   The report should indicate which resources are already in place, which ones have yet to be acquired, and what strategies will be employed to acquire those new resources. The question of which resources must be in place at the time of the review is not a question to which there is a definitive answer. Although not all faculty need be hired, policies for selecting faculty must be in place. Course outlines detailing the content and level of the courses and the ways in which they constitute a coherent program should be prepared. Even if after the program is in operation the institution plans to search for a permanent director or co-ordinator, someone needs to have charge of the program in its planning stages.

   While there is no way to be certain of student interest until the first group registers, the institution should have evidence that there is a qualified potential student body. The report should provide information as to how the new program or site will be financed and how initial costs will be covered. All physical and support services need not be in final form, but the institution should know and document what facilities will be needed, how they will be obtained, and what support services will be available. For all off-campus sites and especially for programs abroad it is essential that lines of authority be clear and that mechanisms for effective oversight and control be in place.

For further information on institutional change, see Chapter VI of *A Handbook of Accreditation*. For further information on the focused evaluation, see Chapter V of *A Handbook of Accreditation* and Chapter VII of *A Manual for the Evaluation Visit*.

APPENDIX

Resources for Self-Study

Resources from the Commission

A primary resource for information on self-study and evaluation is the Commission itself. Commission materials pertinent to an institution's evaluation are usually sent two years before the evaluation visit.

A Collection of Papers on Self-Study and Institutional Improvement. This document has proven to be a valuable source of useful advice about self-study, evaluation, and institutional improvement. It includes papers submitted by presenters at the Commission's Annual Meeting program. $10.00.

Papers and Articles. Commission staff members have developed papers on the evaluation and accreditation process that are available on request. Articles of particular interest to persons in higher education appear in the fall issue of the *NCA Quarterly*.

The Combined Data and Evaluation Form. This staff paper illustrates a "system approach" for doing self-study and evaluation for accreditation. It contains collections of questions about the functions and operations of an institution organized within an evaluative framework according to the Criteria for Accreditation. The questions and their arrangement provide guidance for inquiry and research. $8.00.

Selected Self-Study Reports

Representatives of institutions undertaking self-studies often ask for "good examples" from other institutions. The staff of the Commission have identified a number of such examples for listing as references in this *Guide*. In addition, a wide variety of Self-Study Reports have been selected for review in the Resource Room during the NCA Annual Meeting.

In identifying these examples, the Commission wishes to emphasize **that they are not the only good examples it has received; that these materials are examples, not prescribed models; and that no successful self-study merely replicates the self-study of another institution.** These examples should be used to stimulate each self-study steering committee to develop its own self-study plan and report—a plan and report that are uniquely suited to its own purposes, organization and programs. There is no one "best pattern" for an institutional self-study or report. Institutional representatives should note that any pre-1982 reports they may have on hand do not address the Criteria, which is now required in the Self-Study Report.

Officials of these institutions have agreed to provide copies at cost of their Self-Study Reports to representatives of other North Central Association institutions engaged in the self-study process. Please contact the institutions directly.

1. **Des Moines Area Community College, Ankeny, IA 50012**

   Des Moines Area Community College is a large, multi-campus, public community college, accredited at the associate's degree-granting level. First accredited: 1974. Enrollment: 5,470.

   A reported prepared for a focused evaluation in 1988-89 as required by the comprehensive evaluation of 1986. The report deals clearly and concisely with financial issues which in 1986 were unresolved but which by 1988 were no longer significant. It explores in depth the more difficult challenge of enhancing campus consensus particularly through increased faculty and staff participation in decision-making processes and through structured forms of communication. The report documents the multi-faceted efforts of this institution to respond to the changing educational environment through new programs and initiatives while retaining the support and involvement of all constituents in the institution. It makes excellent use of case studies to document its efforts and achievements.

   Contact: Carroll L. Bennett, Dean of Business/Management

2. **Jefferson College, Hillsboro, MO 63050**

   Jefferson College is a public, comprehensive community college, accredited at the associate's degree-granting level. First accredited: 1969. Enrollment: 2,124.

   A Self-Study Report prepared for a comprehensive evaluation for continued accreditation in 1988-1989. Jefferson College organized its self-study process and report in response to suggestions found in the NCA handbooks. The report is organized around the four Criteria. Extensive use of survey results and graphics permit the report to be evaluative in a balanced way. The Self-Study Report is of moderate length and is presented in a polished format. A second volume presents the Basic Institutional Data Forms.

   Contact: Ray Walsh, Dean of Vocation-Technical Education

3. **Lake Michigan College, Benton Harbor, MI 49022**

   A public, co-educational community college, accredited at the associate's degree-granting level. It has extension sites. First accredited: 1962. Enrollment: 1,651.

   A Self-Study Report prepared for a comprehensive evaluation for continued accreditation in 1988-89. The report is in two parts: a strong narrative section that is organized around the Commission's Criteria and a *Statistical Supplement* that

contains detailed data. Marked by forthright evaluation and excellent graphics, the narrative summarizes the accomplishment of significant changes and initiatives stimulated by a new administration; it also stands as an institutional document by discussing internal differences and by making recommendations for the resolution of them. The report suggests that the institution is well-positioned to meet the future.

Contact: Jean Christensen, Vice President, Student Services and Human Resources

4. Spencer School of Business, Spencer, Iowa 51301

Spencer School of Business is a proprietary, employee-owned institution that awards diplomas and certificates in vocational-technical curricula. Granted candidacy: 1989. Enrollment: 211.

A Self-Study Report prepared for initial candidacy in 1988-1989. Institution-wide participation in the self-study process prepared the institution for initial accreditation. The report is organized around the four Criteria for Candidacy, and, as is expected for candidacy Self-Study Reports, a more extended consideration is given to the General Institutional Requirements. A survey system for the institution was initiated with the self-study process and serves as the basis for an ongoing system to provide routine data to the institution. Data are well-presented and permit the Self-Study Report to be sufficiently evaluative. Among the outcomes of the self-study process were planning documents in the forms of a task chart and a strategy chart.

Contact: James R. Grove, President
or Jan Halsne, Speech and Communications Instructor

5. State Fair Community College, Sedalia MO 65301

A Self-Study Report prepared for a comprehensive evaluation for continued accreditation in 1988-89. First accredited: 1977. Enrollment: 1,092

The self-study process evolved out of the institution's existing council system that had been organized for staff participation in institutional governance. The self-study steering committee reflected the composition of the institution and included not only faculty and administration but support staff and former students. The Self-Study Report is organized around the Criteria for Accreditation. Of note is the emphasis on the assessment of institutional outcomes, including quality of student achievement, quality of institutional life, and quality of contributions to outside communities. The Self-Study also demonstrates how the institution effectively integrated its long-range planning in the self-study process.

Contact: Faith Lovell, Director of Planning

6. College of St. Benedict, St. Joseph, MN 56374

The College of St. Benedict is a Catholic, private, not-for-profit institution in a cooperative agreement with Saint John's University and sponsored by the Sisters of the Order of St. Benedict. Accredited at the Bachelor's degree-granting level. First accredited: 1933. Enrollment: 1,913.

A Self-Study Report prepared for a comprehensive evaluation for continued accreditation in 1988-1989. Campus-wide involvement in the self-study process gave particular attention to the accomplishment of the institution's mission. The Criteria were applied to the three major aspects of the mission statement in the Self-Study Report. The study enabled the institution to see how resources are allocated to the three phases of its mission and to what extent the outcomes are achieved. One outcome of the self-study process was the identification of the areas in which assessment data are incomplete or lacking. Another outcome was a set of recommendations for an ongoing assessment system, which was incorporated into the Presidential planning document.

Contact: David Leitzman, Instructional Developer

7. Aurora University, Aurora, IL 60507

Aurora University is a private, coeducational institution, accredited at the master's degree-granting level. First accredited: 1938. Enrollment: 1373

A Self-Study Report prepared for a comprehensive evaluation for continued accreditation in 1988-89. Aurora University organized its Self-Study Report directly around the four Criteria. Each was discussed in depth, and all significant functional areas of the institution were covered. In recent years, the University has expanded its mission and service area considerably; in addition to its programs on campus it offers several courses and programs in a number of professional fields at sites throughout the Chicago area. As part of this comprehensive evaluation the University asked for approval of an out-of-state site for one of its master's degree programs, and this change request was included in a supplement to the report.

Contact: Douglas Steeples, Vice President for Academic Affairs

8. Langston University, Langston, OK 73050

Langston Univesity is a public, coeducational institution, accredited at the master's degree-granting level. First accredited: 1948. Enrollment: 1759.

A report for an evaluation focused on the University's request to offer the master's (professional curricula) degree in 1988-89. Langston University, an 1890 land-grant institution, has a long history of undergraduate teacher education. The University wished to extend its work in education to the master's degree level; the

new program is designed for practicing teachers who wish to expand their knowledge and improve their teaching skills. The Report outlined in detail the planning of the new program, the courses that would be offered, and how they would be evaluated and reviewed, and the qualifications of the faculty who will teach at the graduate level. Special attention was given to both the historic mission of the University and the ways it continues to respond to changes in the state.

Contact: Jean Manning, Vice President for Academic Affairs

9. Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI 49104

Andrews University is a private, coeducational institution, accredited at the doctoral degree granting level. First accredited: 1922. Enrollment: 2,283

A Self-Study Report prepared for a comprehensive evaluation for continued accreditation in 1988-89. Andrews University organized its report around the four Criteria for Accreditation, but also included a substantial section dealing with special issues. These issues were governance, human resources, the quality of student life, and the University's extension programs and affiliations with colleges and universities throughout the world.

Contact: Patricia B. Mutch, Professor of Home Economics

10. Eden Theological Seminary, Saint Louis, MO 63119

Eden Theological Seminary is a private, graduate institution affiliated with the United Church of Christ, accredited at the doctoral degree-granting level. First accredited: 1972. Enrollment: 106.

The Self-Study Report was prepared for a joint evaluation visit by North Central and the Association of Theological Schools. It is organized around the Commission's Criteria but through a cross-reference Table of Contents documents how it addresses the ATS Criteria as well. The self-study was conducted in a context of institutional change: new president, several new faculty, and significant curricular review among some of the most noticeable changes. It speaks clearly and honestly about the impact of change and, in the process, lays the ground work for long-range institutional planning at the Seminary.

Contact: John Bracke, Dean for Academic Life

11. Oakland University, Rochester, MI 48309

Oakland University is a comprehensive, public university, accredited at the doctoral degree-granting level. First accredited: 1966. Enrollment: 9142.

The Self-Study Report is organized around the Commission's Criteria. For an institution of this size and complexity, the report devotes considerable space to

documenting the University's accomplishments, calling on a variety of measures and techniques. The University used the self-study process as an opportunity to test to "see how adequately the internal image [of the University] conforms to reality." The process also generated information and assessments which were to assist in university-wide planning. Cogent and evaluative, the Report also personalizes the institution through vignettes of faculty and students scattered through the document.

Contact: Sheldon Appleton, Associate Provost

12. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Champaign, IL 61820

The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, is a comprehensive, public research university, accredited at the doctoral degree-granting level. First accredited: 1913. Enrollment: 34,775.

The Self-Study Report reflects the changing self-study process at the University. Started as a regular comprehensive self-study process, it later turned toward two special emphases: undergraduate education and minority issues. The Report, then, has a large section devoted to a comprehensive review of the institution; it is remarkably detailed yet concise for such a large and complex institution. The special emphases reports speak to issues of significant concern to the University and to the efforts of the University to address them.

Contact: Roger E. Martin, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Other Resources

The following are some other resources on self-study and evaluation that may be of interest. Information on availability of these documents can be obtained from the publishers or sponsoring organizations.

Selected Publications

Academic Strategy, The Management Revolution in Higher Education, by George Keller, describes the significant shifts of colleges and universities to a new style of management based on strategic planning and offers an agenda for the future of higher education. (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.)

Assessing Educational Outcomes. New Directions for Institutional Research. No. 47, edited by Peter T. Ewell, provides an overview of many facets of research on student outcomes, shows how outcomes research programs have been organized and implemented in various settings, and provides some basic technical advice about the design of particular types of studies and the communication of results. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.)

Achieving Assessment Goals Using Evaluation Techniques, New Directions for Higher Education, No. 67, edited by Peter J. Gray, proposes two alternative futures for assessment—"(1) broadening the definition of assessment to include a variety of activities formerly identified with evaluation, program review, and accreditation, or (2) regarding assessement as the measurement of student outcomes but seeing it as just one of many techniques for providing data within the context of a more comprehensive process like evaluation." (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989.)

Bibliography on Postsecondary Accreditation, by H.R. Kells, Laura Kells, and M.T. Neal, is available from the Council of Postsecondary Accreditation. (COPA, One Dupont Circle, Suite 305, Washington D.C. 20036, 202/452-1433,1984.)

The Chronicle of Higher Education is an excellent source of current information on publications and meetings related to evaluation and assessment. (1255 Twenty-Third Street, NW, Washington DC 20037.)

College Student Outcomes Assessment: A Talent Development Perspective, by Maryann Jacobi, Alexander Astin, and Frank Ayala, Jr., offers a number of practical suggestions for implementing a comprehensive program of outcomes assessments. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 7, 1987, Publications Department, the George Washington University, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036.)

Effective Evaluation, by Egon G. Guba and Yvonna S. Lincoln, presents an approach combining responsive evaluation and naturalistic methodologies, and discusses how to limit and focus an inquiry and ensure the validity, reliability, and objectivity of its findings. (Jossey-Bass, 1981.)

How to Read a Financial Report, by Merrill Lynch Pierce Fenner & Smith, provides detailed information and illustrations about how to analyze and interpret a corporate financial statement. (Merrill Lynch Pierce Fenner & Smith, Inc., World Financial Center, South Tower, 4th Floor, New York NY 10080-6104, 212/637-7455.)

Implementing Outcomes Assessment: Promise and Perils, edited by Trudy W. Banta, features a series of articles by assessment experts on such issues as implementing assessment, costs and benefits of assessment, cognitive measures in assessing learning, and assessment as an instrument of state funding policy. The publication includes an annotated bibliography of current references and ongoing assessment projects. (New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 59, Volume XV, Number 3, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1988.)

Improving Academic Management, edited by Paul Jedamus and Marvin W. Peterson, includes sections on Academic Planning and Research, Assessing Performance, and Allocating Resources that deal with measuring institutional effectiveness. (Jossey-Bass, 1980.)

Performance and Judgment, Essays on Principles and Practices in the Assessment of College Student Learning, is a series of essays "examining psychometric and allied issues in major target curriculum areas of assessment (basic skills, general education, and the major), in emerging assessment methodologies (performance assessment and computer-interactive testing), and in the assessment of major non-cognitive areas of student growth that are included in the institutional mission statements found in most catalogues." A core essay sets forth basic principles of assessment design. An Annotated Bibliography on the Assessment of Student Educational Outcomes is included as Appendix A. (Information about ordering copies—Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Research. Available from the U.S. Superintendent of Documents, Washington, DC 20402. Call GPO Order Desk at 202/783-3238.)

Qualitative Data Analysis. A Sourcebook of New Methods, by Matthew B. Miles and A. Michael Haberman, presents a conceptual framework and a variety of techniques for qualitative data analysis. This book is particularly helpful in understanding the contrasts and similarities between qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Its emphasis upon the analysis of data and techniques of conclusion drawing/verification substantively expands the usefulness and applicability of this approach to evaluating. (Sage Publications, 1984.)

Qualitative Evaluation Methods, by Michael Quinn Patton, focuses on strategies for generating valid and credible qualitative information that are useful in self-study. It also provides samples of different research strategies and evaluative instruments. (Sage Publications, 1980.)

Ratio Analysis in Higher Education, available from Peat Marwick Main & Co., is a guide to assist colleges and universities in assessing and analyzing the financial condition and activities of the institution. The uses of ratios, their trends and

interinstitutional comparisons, are displayed and explained. (Second Edition, 1987, Peat Marwick Main & Co., 303 E. Wacker Drive, Chicago IL 60601, 312/938-1000.)

Self-Study Processes: A Guide for Postsecondary Institutions. by H.R. Kells, is designed as a handbook for self-study steering committee members and other participants in self-study and accreditation activities. Kells describes the context for and the concept of self-study and suggests general models for self-study. Specific information, checklists and charts are provided for various phases of the self-study process, and major sources of additional information are identified. (Third Edition, Macmillan, ACE Book Series, New York, 1988.)

Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education, Institutional Inventory and Faculty Inventory, are highly recommended for those institutions wishing to use surveys that are meticulously researched and well-designed. Those who have used the surveys have found them to be very appropriate to the institutional self-study process. The Inventories relate to the "Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education" published in 1987 by AAHE and reprinted by the Johnson Foundation as a separate publication. They are available at no cost and in quantity (limit: 300) from The Johnson Foundation, Inc., Processing Center, PO Box 17305, Milwaukee WI 53217.

The Assessment of College Performance, by Richard I. Miller, provides practical assistance in institutional self-assessment in the form of evaluation strategies, models, case studies and specific evaluation aids such as tables, checklists, and rating forms. Miller identifies a number of measurable characteristics of postsecondary institutions, that, together, determine an institution's overall quality or effectiveness. (Jossey-Bass, 1979.)

Understanding Accreditation, by Kenneth E. Young, Charles M. Chambers, H.R. Kells, *et al.*, is a comprehensive examination of how accreditation works, who participates in it, what impact it has on institutions and their various constituencies, and how it can be used to assess institutional achievements and plan improvements. (Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1983.)

Selected Organizations, Instruments for Evaluation

The American Council on Education makes available an annual survey, *Campus Trends*, which describes trends in such areas as enrollment, faculty hiring, curriculum change, assessment, and changing demands on college expenditures. In addition to this survey, ACE also publishes other educational surveys and articles that may be helpful to institutions undergoing self-study. (American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington DC 20036-1193, 202/939-9450.)

The American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) has provided significant leadership in the assessment of educational outcomes, sponsoring annual national

conferences on assessment in higher education. (AAHE Assessment Forum, One Dupont Circle, Suite 600, Washington DC 20036, 202/293-6440.)

The American College Testing Program has a number of instruments, including evaluation/survey instruments—Student Opinion Survey, Withdrawing/Nonreturning Student Survey, and Alumni Survey—offered through the ACT Evaluation/Survey Service. The College Outcomes Measures Program (COMP) measures general educational and intellectual skills through an activity inventory, a composite examination, and an objective test. (The American College Testing Program, PO Box 168, Iowa City IA 52243, 319/337-1000.)

The Association of American Colleges is an organization that promotes liberal learning through grants, publications, workshops and conferences. It focuses on improving the quality of the undergraduate educational experience for all students. AAC publishes *Liberal Education*, which has included over the years specific articles on outcomes assessment and other areas related to evaluation. (Association of American Colleges, 1818 R. Street, NW, Washington DC 20009, 202/387-3760.)

The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges has several publications and services that can be valuable to governing boards engaged in the self-study process. The AGB Board Mentor Program is designed to assist trustees in reviewing the organization and performance of their governing boards. *The Board's Role in Accreditation*, a resource in the Pocket Publication Series, is a useful introduction to effective board participation in the accreditation process. (AGB, One Dupont Circle, Suite 400, Washington D.C. 20036, 202/296-8400.)

The Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL) provides materials and assistance to institutions interested in developing expertise in the assessment of adult and experiential learning. *Assessing Learning—Standards, Principles, and Procedures*, by Urban Whitaker, provides a set of written materials that capture the current state of the art of assessing learning and competence. This publication moves beyond the earlier CAEL literature on assessment, Warren Willingham's *Principles of Good Practice in Assessing Experiential Learning*, 1977, to offer academic and administrative standards for quality assurance in assessing learning for credit. The 1989 publication offers principles and procedures for assessing sponsored learning and prior experiential learning. It also identifies administrative measures to safeguard quality assurance and highlights misconceptions and varieties of malpractice related to assessing learning. Appendices include excellent checklists. (CAEL, c/o School for New Learning, DePaul University, 243 South Wabash, 7th Floor, Chicago IL 60604, 312/341-6733.)

The College Student Experiences Questionnaire, by C. Robert Pace, provides a measure of quality of effort students put into using the facilities and opportunities provided for their learning and development in college. It requires external scoring. (Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA Graduate School of Education, 405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles CA 90024. Second Edition 1983, Format Revision 1986.)

The Council of Graduate Schools (CGS) has developed some instruments and questionnaires to assist in the evaluation of graduate education programs. (The Council of Graduate Schools, One Dupont Circle, Washington D.C. 20036, 202/223-3791.)

The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) has a number of resources available upon request, including the following policy statements: The Role and Value of Accreditation; Rights and Responsibilities of Accrediting Bodies and Institutions in the Accrediting Process; Considerations When Closing a Postsecondary Educational Institution; and Accreditation and Authorization of Distance Learning Through Telecommunications. (Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 305, Washington, DC 20036.)

Educational Testing Service has a number of instruments for institutional self-study, outcomes assessment, planning and faculty evaluation that may be of use to member institutions. The Institutional Research Program in Higher Education offers the following survey instruments: Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI); Small College Goals Inventory (SCGI); Community College Goals Inventory (CCGI); Institutional Functioning Inventory (IFI); Program Self-Assessment Service (PSAS); Student Instructional Report (SIR); and, Student Reactions to College (SRC). ETS and the College Board offer the Academic Profile, a test of the skills derived through general education in which the skills of reading, writing, critical thinking and using mathematical data are tested in the context of humanities, social sciences and natural sciences. The test offers both norm-referenced and criterion-referenced scores. Available through the College-Level Examinations Program of the College Board is the Educational Assessment Series, institutionally administered general education tests in English Composition and Mathematics. In addition, ETS and the GRE Board offer the Major Field Achievement Tests that are shortened and less difficult versions of the GRE Subject Examinations available for use on a campus for assessment of end of major field study for individuals and groups. (Educational Testing Service,College and University Programs, Princeton NJ 08541-0001, 609/921-9000.)

The Higher Educational Management Institute (HEMI) has available a battery of management analysis and development instruments and training elements. (Higher Education Management Institute, PO Box 717, Yellow Springs OH ,45387, 513/767-7255.)

The National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) has useful materials available. *Writers on Financial Management* includes sixty-three articles compiled by NACUBO, many of which provide ways of evaluating effective financial management. (NACUBO Order Desk, One Dupont Circle, Suite 510, Washington D.C. 20036.)

The National Center for Higher Education Management Service has worked with a number of institutions. NCHEMS has developed an outcome-oriented planning, management and evaluation framework that includes an extensive battery of data collection schemes and information system constructs as well as facilities, students, finances, course information, staff, and goal achievement measures. There are two

publications that may be particularly helpful to institutions undergoing the self-study process: *Assessing Institutional Effectiveness: Redirecting the Self-Study Process*, by Peter T. Ewell and Robert P. Lisensky (NCHEMS, 1988), and *Information on Student Outcomes: How to Get It and How to Use It*, an NCHEMS Executive Overview by Peter Ewell (Boulder, CO: NCHEMS,1983), that provides pragmatic information on conceptual dimensions of student outcomes, building a student-outcomes data base, and applying student-outcomes information to institutional decision-making. (NCHEMS, PO Drawer P, Boulder CO 80302, 303/497-0301.)

Index of Commission Policies

The following is an index of Commission policies with references to where information related to each policy can be found in *A Handbook of Accreditation, A Guide to Self-Study for Commission Evaluation,* and *A Manual for the Evaluation Visit.* The index appears in all three publications and is designed as a cross-reference. H/ identifies the *Handbook,* M/ the *Manual,* and G/ the *Guide* followed by the appropriate page number(s). The number ( ) following each policy identifies its internal policy number.

I. EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND THE COMMISSION

A. Policies on Institutional Affiliation

Types of Affiliation (I.A.1) H/9

- Candidacy (I.A.1a.) H/9-10, 18-20
- Accreditation (I.A.1b.) H/9-10, 15-18
- General Institutional Requirements (I.A.1c.) H/10-15

Withdrawal of Application for Accredited or Candidate Status (I.A.2.) H/30

Resignation from Affiliation with the Commission (I.A.3.) H/10

Institutional Obligations of Affiliation (I.A.4.) H/20

Good Practices of Institutional Conduct (I.A.5.) H/69-78, M/18

B. Policies on Accreditation Process

Mechanics of the Process

- Statement of Affiliation Status (I.B.1a.) H/21-24
- Communication with Institution (I.B.1b.) H/13
- Exit Interview (I.B.1c.) H/28, M/22-23
- Distribution of the Team Report (I.B.1d.) M/36
- Public Disclosure of the Team Report (I.B.1e.) H/46
- Institutional Response to Team Report (I.B.1f.) H/28, M/37-38
- Review of Team Recommendation
  - — Readers' Panel (I.B.1g(1). H/28-29, M/38-39
  - — Review Committee (I.B.1g(2).) H/28-29, M/39-40
- Response to Review Committee Recommendation (I.B.1h.) H/29, M/39-40

- Other Recommendations to the Commission
  - — Evaluators' Panel (I.B.1i(1).) H/36-37
  - — Commission Staff Recommendations (I.B.1i(2).) H/31-32, 36-39
- Institutional Use of Review Processes (I.B.1j.) H/28-29, M/37
- Commission Action (I.B.1k.) H/29

Sanctions of the Process

- Memorandum for the Record (I.B.2a.) H/41
- Probation (I.B.2b.) H/41-42
- Commission Withdrawal of Affiliation (I.B.2c.) H/42

Institutional Response to Sanctions

- Reapplication of Institution Denied Candidacy (I.B.3a.) H/20
- Reapplication of Institution Denied Accredited Status (I.B.3b.) .H/20
- Reapplication after Commission Withdrawal of Candidacy or Accreditation (I.B.3c.) H/42
- Grounds for Appeals (I.B.3d.) H/42-43
  - — Institutional Change during Appeal Period (I.B.3d(1).) H/35

C. Policies Regarding Institutional Dynamics

Commission Right to Reconsider Affiliation (I.C.1.) H/31

Changes in an Institution's Operations or Students (I.C.2.) H/37

Changes Affecting the Statement of Affiliation Status (I.C.3.) ... H/33-34

- Commission Delegation of Authority (I.C.3a.) H/31-32, 36-39
- Changes in Institutional Ownership (I.C.3b.) H/38

Institutional Offering of Credit Courses Not Part of Degree Programs (I.C.4.) H/39

Transfer of Credit (I.C.5.) H/79

Separately Accreditable Institutions (I.C.6.) H/39

Transfer of Accreditation (I.C.7.) H/38

International Education (I.C.8.) H/38

Accreditation and Institutional Mergers (I.C.9.) H/38

Accreditation of Closing Institutions (I.C.10.) H/38

II. THE COMMISSION AND CONSULTANT-EVALUATORS

A. Policies on Consultant-Evaluators

Eligibility and Selection of Consultant-Evaluators (II.A.1.) M/8

Length of Appointment (II.A.2.) ..... OR*

Availability of Consultant-Evaluator's Professional Data Forms to Others (II.A.3.) ..... OR*

B. Policies on Visiting Teams

Size of Team (II.B.1.) H/49

Institution Review of Team (II.B.2.) H/27, M/8

Conflict of Interest (II.B.3.) M/4

Commissioners Participation on Teams (II.B.4.) ..... OR*

Observers on Teams (II.B.5.) M/8

C. Policies on Consultant Services

Recommendation of Consultants (II.C.1.) ..... OR*

C-Es Serving as Institutional Consultants (II.C.2.) M/4

Generalist Service (II.C.3.) M/47

III. THE COMMISSION AND OTHER AGENCIES

A. Policies Concerning Other Accrediting Agencies

Professional Accreditation (III.A.1.) H/2

Relationships Between the Commission and Other Institutional or Specialized Accrediting Agencies (III.A.2.) M/46-47

Requirements of Institutions Holding Dual Accreditation (III.A.3.) .. H/2

B. Policies Concerning Governmental Agencies

Relations with U.S. Government (III.B.1.) H/7, 47

Relations with States, Coordinating Boards, and Higher Boards (III.B.2.) H/7, 47

C. *Policies Concerning Specialized Non-Accrediting Agencies*

Unions (III.C.1.) M/18

Intercollegiate Athletics (III.C.2.) ..... OR*

Endorsement of Policies of Other Agencies (III.C.3.) ..... OR*

IV. THE COMMISSION AND THE PUBLIC

A. *Policies on Public Disclosure*

Public Meetings of the Commission (IV.A.1.) ..... OR*

Publication of Institutional Affiliation Status by the Commission (IV.A.2.) H/46-47

Public Disclosure of Team Report (IV.A.3.) H/46

Publication of Reasons for Probation (IV.A.4.) H/41-42

Public Disclosure of the Statement of Affiliation Status (IV.A.5.) H/47

Commission Disclosure of an Institution's Affiliation Status (IV.A.6.) H/46-47

Public Disclosure Notice (IV.A.7.) H/47

B. *Policies on Complaints Against Affiliated Institutions*

Complaints Against Affiliated Institutions (IV.B.1.) H/47-48

V. THE COMMISSION AND ITS STAFF

A. *Policies on Staff Relation with Commission*

Staff Relation with Commission (V.A.1.) H/6, 26; M/15-16

B. *Policies on Staff Relation to Institution*

Staff Relation to Institution (V.B.1.) H/26

OR* Indicates an internal policy not mentioned in the publications. The policy is available from the Commission office on request.

The Commission 1990

Chair: Sue Seibert Farnsworth, (Public Member) Attorney, WV

Vice-Chair: Roland Dille, President, Moorhead State University, MN

Margaret S. Anderson, Public Member, AZ

Otto F. Bauer, Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, University of Nebraska at Omaha, NE

Jack L. Bottenfield, President, Iowa Central Community College, IA

Mary Ann Carroll, Dean, School of Graduate Studies, and Director of Research, Indiana State University, IN

Sr. Austin Doherty, Academic Dean and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Alverno College, WI

Zelema Harris, President, Penn Valley Community College, MO

Bradley D. Jesson, (Public Member), Attorney, AR

Harold Kolenbrander, President, Mount Union College, OH

Rita S. Meyer, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, University of Minnesota-Crookston, MN

Glenn A. Niemeyer, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Grand Valley State University, MI

Patsy Sampson, President, Stephens College, MO

Joan Wadlow, Provost, University of Oklahoma-Norman, OK

Morton W. Weir, Chancellor, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, IL

Ex-Officio: Ronald W. Roskens, President Emeritus and Professor, University of Nebraska, NE (as NCA President)

The Commission Staff

Executive Director ..... Dr. Patricia A. Thrash

Deputy Director ..... Dr. Steven D. Crow

Associate Director (on leave 1989-90) ..... Dr. Joseph J. Semrow

Associate Director/Operations ..... Ms. Susan E. Van Kollenburg

Assistant Director ..... Dr. Jean Mather

Assistant Director ..... Dr. Gerald W. Patton

Visiting Staff Associate (1989-90) ..... Dr. Katherine C. Delaney

Commission Calendar

1990

January 15, 1990 (Chicago, IL)	Review Committee Meeting
February 22-23, 1990 (Chicago, IL)	Commissioners' Meeting
March 17, 1990 (Chicago, IL)	Board of Directors' Meeting
March 18-20, 1990 (Chicago, IL)	NCA Annual Meeting
March 19, 1990 (Chicago, IL)	Commissioners' Meeting
May 11, 1990 (Chicago, IL)	Review Committee Meeting
June 21-22, 1990 (Jackson, WY)	Commissioners' Meeting
July 19-20, 1990 (Chicago, IL)	Review Committee Meeting
August 23-24, 1990 (Chicago, IL)	Commissioners' Meeting
October 18-20, 1990 (Fargo, ND)	Commissioners' Meeting

1991

January 18, 1991 (Chicago, IL)	Review Committee Meeting
February 14-15, 1991 (Chicago, IL)	Commissioners' Meeting
March 16, 1991 (Chicago, IL)	Board of Directors' Meeting
March 17-19, 1991 (Chicago, IL)	NCA Annual Meeting
March 18, 1991 (Chicago, IL)	Commissioners' Meeting
May 20, 1991 (Chicago, IL)	Review Committee Meeting
June 27-28, 1991 (Milwaukee, WI)	Commissioners' Meeting
July 22, 1991 (Chicago, IL)	Review Committee Meeting
August 22-23, 1991 (Chicago, IL)	Commissioners' Meeting
October 17-19, 1991 (Little Rock, AR)	Commissioners' Meeting

Publications Available from the Commission

The following publications can be ordered from the Commission's Chicago office:

A Handbook of Accreditation. This document provides an overview of the Commission's accreditation process and a brief history of how that process has evolved. $4.00.

A Guide to Self-Study for Commission Evaluation. This document provides assistance to institutions preparing for Commission evaluation as they organize and conduct their self-study processes and report the results. $4.00.

A Manual for the Evaluation Visit. This document provides general information about the evaluation visit. $4.00.

NCA Quarterly. The Spring issue of this publication provides the directory of affiliated postsecondary institutions; the Summer issue provides the list of affiliated elementary and secondary schools; the Fall issue features articles of particular interest to persons in higher education; the Winter issue includes articles of particular interest to persons in elementary and secondary schools. Themes of recent Fall issues are: Fall 1987, "Rethinking Accreditation"; Fall 1988, "Issues in International Education"; Fall 1989, "The Role of Institutional Accreditation in Enhancing Quality." Spring issue: $4.00. Summer issue: $5.00. Fall issue: $3.00. Winter issue: $3.00.

A Collection of Papers on Self-Study and Institutional Improvement. This publication includes papers from CIHE Annual Meeting programs that provide advice and suggestions on self-study and address a wide variety of topics related to accreditation and institutional improvement. $10.00.

Briefing. This Commission newsletter is published three times each year. The November issue includes a special insert on the upcoming Annual Meeting. *Briefing* is an invaluable resources for institutions and evaluators who need to be informed of Commission activities. Subscription: $10.00/year.

Accreditation of Postsecondary Institutions: An Overview. This pamphlet provides general information about the accreditation of postsecondary institutions by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. $1.00.

Guidelines on International Education Programs. The following working documents have been developed by Commission staff to assist institutions and teams in planning and evaluating new international education ventures: "Guidelines for Good Practice in Overseas International Education Programs for Non-U.S. Nationals" and "A Practical Guide for Organizing and Conducting International Evaluation Visits." No charge. Limit: one set.

Prices subject to change.

A Guide to Self-Study
for Commission Evaluation